DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 146 CE 012 775

TITLE	Development of Specialists to Serve the Family Life and Impact Home Economics Programs. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Ohio State Univ., Columbus.
BUREAU NO	EPDA-73032
PUB DATE	30 Aug 73
NOTE	74p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Students; Communication Skills; *Disadvantaged Groups; *Family Life Education; Family Programs; Higher Education; Home Economics; Home Economics Skills; *Home Economics Teachers; Inner City; Inservice Teacher Education; *Internship Programs; Preservice Education; Program Attitudes; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Rural Areas; *Sensitivity Training; Student Attitudes; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Ohio

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the project was to provide current and/or prospective impact home economics teachers with opportunities to develop the sensitivity and skills needed to work with disadvantaged populations in inner city and rural areas. Twenty-four participants completed a one-week orientation workshop and a six-week internship. The orientation workshop focused on teaching communication skills, human relation skills, problems and needs of disadvantaged families, methods of teaching adults, and the organization and administration of Ohio's Impact and Family Life Education program. Four on-site locations were inner city and one program served disadvantaged rural districts. The evaluation of the project revealed the major strengths as positive attitudinal changes toward the populations being served; increased understanding of personal traits needed to work with disadvantaged adults as well as needed communication skills, human relations skills, and knowledge of subject matter; increased awareness of potential problems to be encountered when developing a family life program; and increased knowledge of the adult learner and of adult education methods and instructional resources. In addition, the interns were able to establish a favorable working relationship with the adult learners and program personnel and were able to see the inner-city situation in more realistic terms. (Suggestions for minimizing the weaknesses of the program are included in this report.) (BM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED145146

OHIO

FINAL REPORT

EPDA Sub-Project 73032 State of Ohio

"Development of Specialists to Serve the Family Life and Impact Home Economics Programs"

Institution Conducting Activity
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Date Project Completed
August 30, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 012 775

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Budget and Financial Report	1
Sub-Project Priority.	3
Strategies Used to Meet Sub-Project Objectives.	4
Participants and Selection.	6
Evaluation Procedures	7
Results of Evaluation Procedures.	11
Summary and Implications.	27
Appendix.	34

BUDGET AND FINANCIAL REPORT

Project No. 73032

Item	Actual Costs	Budgeted	Balance
1. Project Director's Salary - Lena Bailey			
July 31, 1973	$ 1,450.00	15,400.00	12,500.00
Aug. 21, 1973	1,450.00		
	2,900.00		
2. Secretarial and Clerical Cindy Brenneman			
July 20, 1973	70.40		
Aug. 3, 1973	112.00		
Aug. 31, 1973	86.00		
Kathryn Sims			
Sept. 30, 1973	25.00		
	293.40	3,000.00	2,706.60
3. Consultant - Loyce Hopkins			
Aug. 23, 1974	50.00	600.00	550.00
4. Employee Benefits			
STRS Aug. 27, 1973	187.05	2,804.00	2,429.90
STRS Sept. 26, 1973	187.05		
	374.10		
5. Travel			
Project Director Sept. 4, 1973	105.60	4,700.00	4,594.40
6. Office Supplies, Duplicating, etc.			
OSU General Stores			
Aug. 1, 1973	44.24		
Aug. 1, 1973	6.00		
	50.24	580.00	529.76
7. Instructional Supplies			
Western Publishing Co. July 23	24.00		
Charles E. Merrill Publishers Aug. 1	16.95		
	40.95	467.00	426.05

BUDGET AND FINANCIAL REPORT
Continued

Item		Actual Costs	Budgeted	Balance
8. Participants				
July 16	Field Service	5,236.00		
Aug. 1	Field Service	2,530.00		
Aug. 14	Field Service	1,265.00		
Sept. 4	Travel	848.50		
		9,879.50	11,155.00	1,275.50
9. Indirect Cost				
Ohio State University Overhead		1,095.50	3,096.00	2,000.50
Total		$14,789.29	$41,802.00	$27,012.71

SUB-PROJECT PRIORITY

This project was conducted to meet the needs expressed in Priority C. The family life program for adults in the inner-city and rural areas as well as the impact home economics program at the seventh, eighth, and ninthgrade levels have experienced rapid growth in the past few years. There is a shortage of professional personnel to staff these programs; especially personnel who are sensitive to the needs to be met and who possess the knowledge and skills required to help meet these needs. The teacher often comes from outside the area in which she is to teach and lacks a real understanding of the situation and the people involved.

STRATEGIES USED TO MEET SUB-PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The overall purpose of the project was to provide the teacher or prospective teacher who comes from outside the area being served with opportunities to develop sensitivity to the teaching situation. The following objectives are in keeping with this purpose:

1. To provide 24 potential impact home economics teachers with an opportunity to experience an inner-city teaching situation.
2. To sensitize the interns to the teaching situation and the dynamics of the inner-city.

The following steps were taken as a means of successfully accomplishing the two broad objectives of the project:

1. Communicated in person and in writing with family life education directors to seek their cooperation in planning and implementing the project.
2. Communication about the intern project was sent to teacher educators, supervisors, and others interested.
3. Participants (interns) were selected by a committee from those who had applied (see Appendix for copy of application form).
4. Intern Centers were selected based on those who were willing to participate, quality program, and upon student (interns) preference.
5. Selected and/or developed evaluation devices.
6. Developed a block plan of activities for the seven-week project.
7. Developed plans and implemented the plans for a one-week orientation workshop, a two-day seminar, a one-day seminar as well as to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the entire project.

8. Project director visited the interns in each of the participating centers to observe the situation, to help the intern with any problems encountered, and to show successes experienced throughout the six weeks of on-site participation.

9. Sent evaluation forms to Family Life Education Directors.

10. Developed final report of the project.

The program extended over a seven-week period during the summer of 1973 (June 18 - August 3). During the first week, the participants (interns) attended a workshop which was designed to prepare them to take full advantage of the forthcoming experiences as an intern in a family life education program. The remaining six weeks were spent in a selected family life education program under the supervision of a family life education director as well as the project director. Midway through the internship, a two-day seminar was held to give interns an opportunity to intellectualize their experiences, to relate problems encountered, and to hear the experiences of other professionals who work and teach adults in inner-city situations. At the end of the internship, a final seminar was held to evaluate the entire intern program (see Appendix for the agenda of the orientation workshop and the seminars).

PARTICIPANTS AND SELECTION PROCEDURE

Twenty-one prospective home economics teachers and three teachers with 3 months, 2 1/2 and 3 years of teaching experience, respectively, were selected to participate in the project. Of the twenty-one prospective teachers, thirteen were college seniors and eight were juniors. However, one student dropped out of the program near the end of the experience because of illness. Therefore, twenty-three individuals completed the experience. The twenty-three participants represented six different universities in Ohio.

The participants were selected on (1) a sincere desire to work with people living in economically deprived areas and (2) upon recommendation of their college advisor or supervisor. Applicants were reviewed by a committee composed of Mrs. Sonia Cole, Assistant Director of Vocational Home Economics, Ohio State Department of Education; Mrs. Alice Johnson, Director of the Columbus Metropolitan Home and Family Life Program; and Dr. Lena Bailey, project director.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Five evaluation devices were used to assess selected aspects of the summer intern experience in a family life education program. The instrument, The Teacher and The Community, was developed by Dr. Ruth Lehman in 1964 at The Ohio State University. The device measures the extent to which prospective teachers accept individuals unlike themselves. Dr. Lehman considered the primary purpose of the instrument as a pre-post measure in attitudinal research.

Dr. Lehman gave three assumptions which undergirded the development of the instrument: (1) teachers who accept persons different from themselves are more effective than they might be otherwise; (2) understanding comes from experiences and with understanding acceptance; (3) the university has a responsibility for helping students to evaluate their personal attitudes and broaden their experiences with others who are different from them. (Ruth T. Lehman, "Attitudes Toward Groups and Families," Home Economics Teachers, Pre-Service and In-Service Levels, Their Interest in Teaching, Their Attitudes Toward Children and Families; eds.,

Chadderton, Coon, Ford, and Lehman. Minneapolis: Bureau of Educational Research, 1966, pp. 85-128.)

The Lehman instrument is composed of eleven categories and assesses attitudes toward various peoples: parents; city, town, and farm people; divorced and working mothers; foreigners; little education and college education; slum families; catholic, Jews, and protestants; upper and middle class; a problem school; youth and aged; another race; and factory workers. This instrument was tested by the split-half method and had a reliability of .912 and by the Spearman-Brown formula with a reliability of .945.

The Teacher and The Community Inventory was administered to the interns on the first day of the orientation seminar and again on the last day during the follow-up seminar.

The Guilford Zimmerman Tempermanent Survey was also administered to the interns on the first and last days of the project. The survey includes in one schedule ten major scales: (1) general activity, (2) restraint, (3) ascendance, (4) sociability, (5) emotional stability, (6) objectivity, (7) friendliness, (8) thoughtfulness, (9) personal relations, (10) masculinity.

Estimates of the reliability of the survey were made in several ways. The Kuder-Richardson formulas were applied to data for men and women separately and combined. Odd-even and first-half second-half correlations were obtained from a

random sample of 100 men. The coefficients vary between .75 and .85. The internal validity or factorial validity of the scores is fairly well assured by the foundation of factor-analysis studies as well as the successive item-analysis directed toward internal consistency and uniqueness.

The decision to administer the instrument was based on the assumption that it would assess ten important aspects of the total personality that would have an influence on one's abil ty to work effectively with people from varying cultural, social, and economical backgrounds.

Through the six weeks of on-site participation in a family life education program, the interns were asked to keep a weekly log of their experiences. The log was composed of five parts: (1) general comments, (2) personal traits, (3) home economic skills, (4) communication skills, and (5) problems. It was designed to collect subjective information, on a continuous basis, relating to personal and professional skills needed to work effectively with adult learners in an urban or rural family life education program.

An intern or student participant two-part questionnaire was developed and administered at the end of the project. On this questionnaire the interns were asked to indicate their feelings with regard to the usefulness of the six-week experience in terms of twenty-one functions. They were asked to respond to each of the functions as: very useful, useful, somewhat useful, uncertain, or not useful.

An evaluation device composed of seven questions was mailed to the directors and teachers of family life programs at the end of the project. The questions focused on: interns' ability to work effectively in the situation, problems encountered, how to alleviate problems encountered, the extent to which the experience helped to prepare the interns for teaching, and personal judgments about the values and limitations of the intern project.

RESULTS OF EVALUATION PROCEDURES

This section of the report includes the data resulting from the two tests administered, two questionnaires completed, and weekly logs kept by each of the student interns.

The Teacher and The Community Inventory

Can a six-week summer experience in which students work with individuals in a lower socio-economic environment be a means of improving attitude toward others different from one's self?

A "t" test revealed that there was a significant gain in the student's attitude at the .05 per cent level of significance in two of the twelve areas of concern measured by the Lehman Inventory. As indicated in Table 1, the two areas are community populations and slum families. There was a slight increase in attitudinal change toward foreigners, educational levels, religious groups, a problem school, youth and aged, and factory workers. However, the change was not statistically significant. There was regression in group scores in the areas of parents today, divorce and working mothers, socio-economics classes and another race.

The primary focus of the summer experience was related to working with socio-economically disadvantaged individuals. This focus could account for the significant

changes in attitudes toward community populations and slum families as measured by the Lehman Inventory.

Table 2 provides a further breakdown of the categories of the inventory. As can be seen in this table, the change in attitude toward community populations can be attributed specifically to positive change in attitude toward Jews. One student in the total group had a Jewish background.

Table 2 also provides a specific identification of the area where there is regression in test scores—farm people, divorce, working mothers, catholics, upper class, middle class, aged, and another race.

When looking at these data it seems important to remember that all students volunteered for the summer experience and expressed a desire to work with people who were socio-economically handicapped.

TABLE 1

ATTITUDE SCORES ON THE TEACHER AND THE COMMUNITY INVENTORY

Test Categories	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	Mean Diff.	S.D.	"t" Value
I Parents Today	48.4348	48.0000	0.4348	7.076	0.29
II Community Populations	19.0952	19.6031	-0.5079	1.063	-2.19*
III Divorce and Working Mothers	30.9280	30.3810	-0.5476	2.554	0.98
IV Foreigners	62.5652	62.6956	-0.1304	4.556	-0.14
V Educational Levels	28.0952	29.1429	-1.0476	3.240	-1.48
VI Slum Families	58.1739	61.7391	-3.5652	1.350	-2.64*
VII Religious Groups	19.7619	19.9047	-0.1429	1.493	-0.44
VIII Socio-Economic Classes	27.0000	26.5714	0.4286	1.825	1.08
IX A Problem School	61.9565	62.5652	-0.6087	5.952	-0.49
X Youth - Aged	27.3810	27.8571	-0.4762	4.303	-0.51
XI Another Race	55.7391	55.3043	0.4348	9.666	0.22
XII Factory Workers	58.1739	59.8696	-1.6956	5.811	-1.40
Total	683.4780	689.3911	-5.9131	55.297	-0.51

*Significant at the .05 level (a minus preceding the scores represents an increase).

TABLE 2

ATTITUDE SCORES ON THE TEACHER AND THE COMMUNITY INVENTORY

Test	Categories	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	Mean Diff.	S.D.	"t" Value
I	Parents Today	48.4348	48.0000	0.4348	7.076	0.29
II	City People	18.6956	19.0435	-0.3478	2.622	-0.64
	Town People	18.1304	18.5217	-0.3913	2.572	-0.73
	Farm People	20.8696	20.8261	0.0435	2.286	0.09
III	Divorce	32.4348	32.0000	0.4348	3.501	0.60
	Working Mothers	29.3333	28.6667	0.6667	2.904	1.05
IV	Foreigners	62.5652	62.6956	-0.1304	4.556	-0.14
V	Little Education	36.1739	36.9565	-0.7826	3.630	-1.03
	College Education	20.2381	21.3333	-1.0952	3.754	-1.34
VI	Slum Families	58.1739	61.7391	-3.5652	6.473	-2.64*
VII	Catholics	18.4783	18.1304	0.3478	1.968	0.85
	Jews	20.8571	21.7143	-0.8571	1.682	-2.34*
	Protestants	20.0909	20.0909	0.0000	2.047	0.00
VIII	Upper Class	35.5652	56.0000	0.5652	2.873	0.94
	Middle Class	18.2857	18.2381	0.0476	1.532	0.14

TABLE 2--Continued

Test Categories		Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	Mean Diff.	S.D.	"t" Value
IX	A Problem School	61.9565	62.5652	-0.6087	5.952	-0.49
X	Youth	25.5652	26.6087	-1.0435	7.258	-0.69
	Aged	29.1429	29.0952	0.0476	3.879	0.06
XI	Another Race	55.7391	55.3043	0.4348	9.666	0.22
XII	Factory Workers	58.1739	59.8696	-1.6956	5.811	-1.40
	Total	683.4780	689.3911	-5.9131	55.297	-0.51

*Significant at .05 level.

Guilford-Zimmerman Survey

Does a summer intern experience of observing and teaching in a family education program in a socio-economically deprived environment alter the temperament of the student interns?

Table 3 presents the results of a "t" test applied to pre and post scores of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. These data indicate generally that the temperament did meet change significantly in a positive direction. However, there is an indication that regression occurred on scores in six of the ten categories of the test. The students' scores, as a group, decreased significantly in the category of emotional stability. Other areas of some regression on scores include restraint, friendliness, and thoughtfulness as well as slight regression in personal relations and masculinity.

Although the analysis indicates an overall regression in temperament, this could be explained partially perhaps by the fact that this kind of experience was new for the students and it may have been a fearful one. The Langberg and Freedman[1] study dealt with non-volunteers and revealed that positive characteristics were over-shadowed by a superficial

---

[1]Langberg, George and Freedman, Philip. "Self-Selection of Student Teachers," Education for the Disadvantaged Current Issues & Research (ed. Harry Miller), New York, The Free Press, 1967, p. 202.

fearfulness of the special service school situation. Furthermore, their study revealed that once fearfulness was overcome, the teachers were ready to accept the inner-city school.

TABLE 3

ATTITUDE SCORES ON GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN SURVEY

Test Categories	Pretest Means	Post Test Means	Mean Diff.	S.D.	"t" values
General Activity	18.9130	19.0000	-0.0870	2.922	-0.14
Restraint	18.5217	17.6522	0.8696	2.719	1.53
Ascendance	16.2609	16.4783	-0.2174	2.449	-0.43
Sociability	20.2174	20.2609	-0.0435	3.268	-0.06
Emotional Stability	19.1304	17.7826	1.3478	2.724	2.37*
Objectivity	17.2609	17.2609	0.0000	4.101	0.00
Friendliness	18.0869	16.6087	1.4783	3.604	1.97
Thoughtfulness	20.3043	19.5652	0.7391	2.880	1.23
Personal Relations	16.1304	16.0869	0.0435	3.496	0.06
Masculinity	12.6522	11.9565	0.6957	6.175	0.54

*.05 significance decrease in emotional security

Summary of Weekly Logs

The student interns were asked to keep a weekly log (see Appendix, p. 50) which was comprised of six parts—general comments, personal traits needed while working with adults, communication skills, problems encountered, and a

summary of weekly activities. Although the data gleaned from the weekly logs are highly subjective, they are, nevertheless, quite helpful in assessing some of the knowledge and skills needed by students while working in the various inner-city family life education programs.

The most frequently mentioned new learning for the students was the development of an increased awareness of different people with a different mode of life style. Moreover the students indicated an increased recognition of the needs of the people, i.e. legal problems, housing, family life problems, and other related problems. Another area in which the students indicated increased awareness was the need for honesty and openness while working with the adults as well as a need to teach in a simple and informal way. Moreover the students indicated that in terms of their own feelings of growth that they developed more self-awareness and increased feeling of success and self-confidence. The student interns were asked to indicate personal traits needed while working with adults and their children. The traits most frequently cited were a sensitivity to needs; recognition and acceptance of different life styles and values; tact, diplomacy and respect.

Home Economics knowledge and skills needed that were most frequently indicated by the students were clothing construction and care, food and nutrition, child care and human relationships. Communication skills that were most

frequently indicated were giving directions in a clear, concise manner; ability to carry on "small talk"; to listen carefully and to comprehend.

The most frequently indicated problems which the students encountered were communications related problems, racial concerns, problems related to children, transportation, poor class attendance and class boredom.

Results of Intern Questionnaire

In any teaching-learning situation, the student is the raison d'etre. Any experienced teacher realizes the relationship between how students feel about an educational experience and the success of that experience. Ultimately, the success of any educational endeavor depends upon the student's acceptance of it. Therefore, the interns were asked to give their evaluation to the usefulness of the experience. These reactions were obtained by means of a questionnaire composed of two parts (Appendix, p. 53).

The questionnaire contained items considered significant to a successful intern experience. The first part of the instrument contained fourteen items. Five major concepts were used as a framework for developing this part of the questionnaire—learning, the learning environment, home economics subject matter, instructional strategies and the role and responsibilities of the family life education director. These particular concepts were used because knowledge and understanding related to them is generally

considered essential to preparation for successful teaching. Therefore, it seemed necessary to determine the extent, if any, to which the experience contributed to expanding students' understanding of these concepts.

The interns were asked to respond to the fourteen items by rating each one as very useful (3), useful (2), somewhat useful (1), uncertain (0), or not useful (-1). The numbers in the parentheses indicate the weight assigned to each rating and were used as a means of identifying the relative importance of each level of rating. The weighted responses from each of the interns were tallied and then a mean score was determined. Table 4 reveals the results of this procedure. Ten of the fourteen items rated useful to very useful focused on learning and the learning environment, and the role and responsibilities of the family life director. The four items (8, 9, 10, 11) that were rated somewhat useful dealt with home economics programs and instructional strategies.

Further to assess the student interns' opinions pertinent to their experience in a family life education program, they were asked to give their reactions to seven questions which constituted the second part of the questionnaire. The interns responded to the questions by checking yes, no, or uncertain.

TABLE 4

STUDENT RATINGS OF USEFULNESS OF VARIOUS FUNCTIONS OF INTERN EXPERIENCE

Intern Experience Function	Mean Scores*
The intern experience was useful in helping me to understand:	
1. The kind of environment which promotes learning.	2.17
2. Differences in the mental abilities among adult learners.	2.21
3. The different paces at which adults learn.	2.52
4. Differences in the interests of adults.	2.52
5. Differences in the emotional development of adult learners.	2.34
6. Ways of identifying adult problems in learning.	2.04
7. The elements of the teaching-learning situation which have an effect upon adult behavior.	2.22
8. The content of course offerings in home economics.	1.73
9. The specific skills needed for successful teaching of home economics.	1.91
10. How to use effectively a variety of teaching techniques.	1.65
11. How to use instructional materials in a way that promotes learning.	1.56
12. The role of the teacher in the family life program.	2.69
13. The various responsibilities of the family life director.	2.04
14. The atmosphere or "tone" of a learning situation.	2.39

*Very useful (3), Useful (2), Somewhat useful (1), Uncertain (0), Not useful (-1).

Table 5 is a tabulation of their responses. The responses are presented in percentages for ease in understanding, rather than in actual numbers of students who responded to the question in one of the three ways possible.

Items two, six and seven received a rating of 90 per cent, or better, which appear to indicate that the interns felt that the orientation workshop and the mid-term seminar were helpful in preparing them for the intern experience. Furthermore, they felt that the experience contributed to preparation for student teaching and/or teaching. Items four and five received a rating of 90 per cent or more. Therefore, it appears that the interns did not feel that they spent an excessive amount of time participating in the family life program during each of the six weeks. Nor did the interns lose interest in the experience. It does appear, however, that only about 50 per cent did the kinds of things they thought they would be doing when they first began the intern experience. This is evident by the ratings on item three.

TABLE 5

STUDENT REPORTS OF THEIR REACTIONS WITH REFERENCE TO THE INTERN EXPERIENCE

Question	Total Response	Yes		No		Uncertain	
		No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1. Did you look forward to the intern experience each week?	23	17	73.91	1	4.34	5	21.73
2. Do you feel that the workshop helped to prepare you for the experience? Explain.	23	22	95.65	1	4.34	0	---
3. Did you do the things that you thought you would do when you first began the intern experience? If not, what did you expect?	23	8	34.78	12	52.17	3	13.04
4. Did you feel that you spent more time each week participating than you should?	23	1	4.34	21	91.30	1	4.34
5. Do you feel that you gradually lost interest in the intern experience? If yes, why?	23	1	4.34	21	91.30	1	4.34
6. Do you feel that the intern experience contributed to your preparation for student teaching or teaching?	23	22	95.65	1	4.34	-	---
7. Do you feel that the mid-term seminar discussion was helpful? Explain.	22	20	90.90	1	4.54	-	---

Summary of Questionnaires for Directors and Teachers of Family Life Education Programs

Each of the directors and teachers of family life education programs in locations where the students had interned for six weeks were asked to respond to seven questions. The questions are listed below along with the responses. Similar responses were grouped and the frequency of the responses is indicated by a number in parentheses.

Questions and Responses

Do you feel that the interns were able to establish favorable working relationships with the adults in class? Why or why not?

Yes - the interns were friendly, helpful, sincere in their desire to learn more about the adults (15).

Somewhat - it seems to vary a lot with the individual (3).

Do you feel that the interns worked well with the teacher(s) in the family life programs? Why? Why not?

Yes - they were willing to try anything; we respected each other as professionals; they worked beautifully (16).

Somewhat - fearful of letting intern take over class and felt intern did not work hard (2).

If given another opportunity, what would you do differently to meet the needs of the interns?

- Pre-plan earlier (10).
- Meet with the interns weekly in an informal discussion to show ideas and the like (4).
- More involvement in total situation (4).

Identify problemswhich arose out of the intern experience which might be of concern when planning for future intern programs.

-Better preparation is needed in human relations skills and knowledge of community (8).

-No major problems (7).

-Not enough participation time (3).

-Uncertain as to what to expect from interns (1).

What could be done to alleviate the problems or improve the situations as identified in number four?

-More time for planning for the intern summer experience (5).

-Provide more participation time (3).

-Help interns understand that teaching is a demanding activity (1).

-Help interns understand that listening is as important as instructing (1).

To what extent do you think the intern experience helps to prepare the interns for teaching?

-Enabled them to see the inner-city in more realistic terms (5).

-A real lesson in endurance; tolerance, understanding problems related to teaching the adult learner (2).

Give some indication of your personal feelings concerning the value and/or limitations of the experience.

-Really enjoyed having the interns; a most worthwhile experience; they (interns) added sparkle to our program; should be continued (14).

-A most valuable experience; revealed knowledge about the welfare recipient and their environment; generally broadened students' background (1).

The responses to the questions as provided by the directors and teachers of family life education programs, in general, are positive toward both the interns and the intern program. On the other hand, the responses indicated a need to plan earlier and an implied need was to plan more rigorously for the experience.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This summary will provide a capsule review of the project and will attempt to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the project including suggestions for minimizing the weaknesses and the actual and expected impact upon the educational delivery system of the state.

Twenty-one prospective teachers who were college junior and seniors in home economics education and three teachers with less than three years of teaching experience participated in the project. All were from middle income background with very limited experiences with people different from themselves. Moreover, all expressed a desire and willingness to participate in the family life education program to gain a better understanding of the knowledge and skills needed to work with adults from lower socio-economic situations.

To prepare the participants who were called interns for the experience, an orientation workshop was planned and implemented. The plans for the workshop were developed in light of input from family life education directors throughout the state. It was designed to focus attention on communication skills, human relation skills, problems and needs of disadvantaged families, methods of teaching adults and the organization and administration of Ohio's Impact and Family Life Education programs.

Throughout the week-long orientation workshop, the interns participated by doing related readings and through games, simulations, role playing, field trip, group interaction and listening to informed speakers.

Following the orientation workshop, the interns spent six weeks of on-site participation in a family life education program. The programs were in five different locations throughout the state of Ohio. Four of these programs were located in the inner-city and one program served disadvantaged rural adults.

During the six weeks the interns worked in the programs performing most of the duties and responsibilities of the regular teacher. The project director made visits to the various programs to discuss experiences, pro and con, with the interns and the teachers.

Midway through the experience the interns assembled for a two-day seminar at which time experiences and problems were shared and analyzed. Again at the end of the seven-week project, the interns assembled for an evaluation of the summer experiences.

Prior to, throughout the project, and at the close of the project, evaluation procedures were carried out. As a result, some of the most apparent strengths of the project were:

1. A positive attitudinal change of the group of interns toward inner-city families and community populations as measured by the Lehman survey.

2. An increased understanding of the personal traits needed to work with disadvantaged adults as well as needed communication skills, human relations skills, and knowledge of home economics subject matter.
3. An increased awareness of the potential problems which are likely to be encountered when organizing, administering, and implementing a family life program, i.e. racial differences, transportation, class attendance, home economics knowledge and skills needed by the adults versus that which the adults will accept.
4. An increased knowledge of the methods of teaching and instructional resources to use when teaching adults.
5. An increased knowledge of the characteristics of the adult learner.

(Evidence to support Items 2 thru 5 was gleaned from the intern weekly logs and questionnaires.)

6. The interns were able to establish a favorable working relationship with the adult learners and with the directors and teachers of the programs.
7. The interns were able to see the inner-city situation in more realistic terms; gained knowledge of the needs and concerns of the welfare families and the environment in which they live.

(Evidence to support Items 6 and 7 was gleaned from questionnaires completed by directors and teachers of family life programs participating in the project.)

Another very apparent strength of the project was the sense of commitment to serve and the development of comradeship among the interns. Although many of the interns did not know each other prior to the project, their sincere desire to understand and to serve the disadvantaged seemed to bind the group together; to give purpose and meaning to their endeavors. Thus, some of the most rewarding discussions emerged from the workshop and seminar sessions.

A by-product of the final evaluation seminar was some insight into the strengths and weaknesses of Ohio's family life education programs. The final seminar as well as the evaluation procedures also gave insights into the weaknesses of the summer intern project. The following paragraphs will relate the most apparent weaknesses.

There was regression on post test scores of the Guilford Zimmerman Scale. According to related research this was probably due to fear. Once students have had time to adapt and adjust this usually reverses. This infers, perhaps, that the preparation for the experience and the length of time in the program needs some adjustments. To remedy this, the interns could spend time, at intervals, during the orientation workshop in an inner-city program with the adults. These visits could and should be followed

up by individual and group analysis of the experiences. Another approach would be to visit vicariously through films or videotape the various programs and the environment around the family life centers. This should be followed up with individual and group analysis. Of course, this should be done prior to the on-site internship.

To estimate an appropriate length of time for the experience is difficult. Some of the program directors indicated that the internship should have been longer. Six weeks is a relatively short period of time to overcome anxiety and fear. (The weekly logs indicated that the intern experienced fear and being ill-at-ease.) Each person adapts and adjusts at an individual rate. Perhaps to extend the experience to eight weeks would help somewhat to solve the problem.

The interns and the directors seemed at a loss as to what were the roles and responsibilities of each during the internship. This could be solved easily by establishing more lead time for the project and by a more rigorous plan for communicating with the groups prior to the onset of the project. Another related weakness of the project was in regard to the interns' knowledge of the purposes of the programs in family life education. The results of the questionnaires indicated that during the internship they did not do the things they thought they would do (see Table 5). To eliminate this weakness, the directors of the programs

should be invited to the orientation workshop to explain fully the purpose and functions of the various programs. An attempt was made to explain the organization and administration of the various programs but this, apparently, was not sufficient.

A weakness, as indicated by the directors and teachers, was in the area of human relations skills. It was felt that many of the interns should have entered the internship with better ability to work with the adults. However, the questionnaires completed by teachers indicated that by the end of the internship almost all interns had developed a sound working relationship with the adults. Since the primary purpose of the project was to develop, on the part of the interns, a sensitivity to the teaching situation and the dynamics of the inner-city, this result should be viewed as an overwhelming strength of the project.

Perhaps the primary impact of the project on the educational delivery system of the state is related to the project being a "first" of its kind in the state. Home Economics Teacher Education programs could use the project as a model for determining the feasibility of and for developing a similar type of "hands-on" experience for their prospective teachers. A potential impact is related to the increased knowledge and skills developed by the interns which will enhance, hopefully, their ability to teach more effectively. Thereby giving more justification

to the implementation of the project as a sound and worthwhile educational endeavor.

Some weeks after the project came to a close, several of those who participated in the project were asked to assess the experience in retrospect. The following statement reflects the concensus of those interviewed, "It was one of the most valuable and meaningful experiences of my life."

APPENDIX

STATE OF OHIO
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
COLUMBUS
43215

MARTIN ESSEX
UPERINTENDENT OF
UBLIC INSTRUCTION

DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL
EDUCATION
612 Ohio Departments Building

April 23, 1973

TO: Teacher Educators

FROM: Sonia M. Cole, Assistant Director, Vocational Education
Home Economics Section

RE: Summer Intern Program for Selected Juniors or Seniors and Experienced Teachers in Home Economics Education

We are happy to announce a new and exciting opportunity for junior or senior students and experienced interested teachers in home economics education. Fifteen to twenty interested persons will be selected to take part in a summer intern experience in a Family Life Education program.

This federally funded E.P.D.A. Project has been approved for the purpose of developing specialists to serve the Family Life and Impact home economics programs in Ohio. The intern program will extend over a period of seven weeks during the summer of 1973 - beginning June 18 and extending through August 3. The first week will be devoted to a pre-service training program designed to prepare the interns to take full advantage of the experience. The next six weeks will be spent in teaching an inner-city program. One two-day seminar will be conducted for all interns during the fourth week.

Each of the interns will receive $55.00 per week subsistence allowance as well as travel allowance to and from the pre-service workshop and the two-day seminar. Assistance will be available to those who need to locate housing. Centers to be used will include: Columbus, Dayton, Cleveland, Youngstown and Zanesville.

We are giving each of you an opportunity to recommend potential interns, but you will not be asked to give supervision to the program since I have contracted for the services of Dr. Lena Bailey for this summer program. We certainly would encourage you to visit your students on-the-job at anytime during the summer.

If you do have students making application for the project, you will need to decide whether or not to give credit for the summer intern program as well as the amount of credit. The mechanics of granting university credit will need to be worked out by each of the home economics teacher education departments involved.

For futher information you may contact Dr. Lena Bailey, The Ohio State University, 1787 Neil Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Interested students may use the enclosed form to apply for the summer intern experience.

A committee will review and select the participants who seemingly have a sincere desire to work with persons living in economically deprived areas. Notification of acceptance will be made by MAY 15.

RETURN TO DR. LENA BAILEY, O.S.U.
DUE DATE: MAY 4, 1973

SUMMER INTERN EXPERIENCE
APPLICATION FORM

Name _____

Current Address _____ Telephone No. _____

Home Address _____

Age _____ University Rank (circle) Senior Junior

Occupation of Father: _____

Occupation of Mother: _____

Work Experiences: (paid and non-paid) examples: waitress, tutoring

_____

_____

Student Field Experiences: _____

_____

Have you had student teaching? _____ When? _____ If not, when do you plan to do student teaching? _____.

Choice of Centers for Intern Experience. [Check first (1) and second (2) choice]

_____ Columbus

_____ Cleveland

_____ Dayton

_____ Youngstown

_____ Zanesville

Why do you wish to be placed in the center indicated above? _____

_____

Why are you interested in this particular intern experience? _____

_____

_____

Advisor's Signature _____

College _____

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Dear

Congratulations upon being selected to participate in the summer intern program in home economics education. We feel that this experience will be both exciting and challenging.

Tentative plans for the seven week program include an orientation workshop to be held during the week of June 18-22 at the Imperial House Arlington in Columbus, Ohio. For interns living outside the Columbus area, hotel accomcdations, lunches and travel expenses will be provided. However each intern will need to provide for her own breakfast and evening meal. Interns living in Columbus will need to make their own arrangements other than lunch. Additional information will be made available to you as plans for the program are developed further.

Your experience will take place in the area. I hope this is satisfactory to you. If not please contact me right away.

I am looking forward to working with you through the experience (June 18-Aug. 3). Please feel free to contact me if you have concerns which need immediate attention.

Sincerely yours,

Lena Bailey
Home Economics Education

The School of Home Economics / College of Agriculture and Home Economics / 1787 Neil Avenue / Columbus, Ohio 43210 / Phone (614) 422-6761

PERSONAL DATA FORM

Name_____ Age_____

Social Security Number _____

Address During Internship _____

_____ Phone _____

Address Following Internship _____

_____ Phone _____

Rank: Junior ____ Senior ____ Teacher ____ Years of Teaching _____

University _____

Previous Experiences with People Having Special Needs:

PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT

COLUMBUS

Leslie Gilbert
30 East Frambes St
Apt. B2
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Barbara Glantz
30 E. Lane Avenue
Apt. 306
Columbus, Ohio 43201
Phone: 299-2990

Linda Wyer
1814 Forest Willow Ct.
Apt. D
Columbus, Ohio 43229
Phone: 846-7762

Beverly Morter
18 Indianola Court
Columbus, Ohio
Phone: 294-2184

Martha Wahl
1919 Indianola Avenue
Columbus, Ohio
Phone: 294-3949

Mona Elsass
43 E. 18th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio
Phone: 291-6219

Cinda Brenneman
153 E. 12th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201
Phone: 291-0378

YOUNGSTOWN

Cheryl Sanly
950 Katherine
Youngstown, Ohio
Phone: 216-743-9475

Carol Kuch
950 Katherine
Youngstown, Ohio

DAYTON

Nancy Rahn
4876 Northgate Ct.
Dayton, Ohio 45416
Phone: 513-278-1706

Georgina Shahan
601 W. Wenger Road
Apt. 92
Englewood, Ohio 45322

Joy Keller
Route 2
Camden, Ohio
Phone: 452-3175

Cheryl Moxley
11994 Cedar Creek Drive
Cincinnati, Ohio 45240
Phone: 513-825-4224

Bonnie McNabb
6 Ohio Avenue
Monroe, Ohio
Phone: 539-7160

Kathleen Klosterman
4316 City View Terrace Apt. D
Dayton, Ohio 45431
Phone: 256-9679

Denise Ross
917 Tudor Road
Dayton, Ohio 45419
Phone: 298-9351

Debbie Poling
3525 Danridge Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45407

Kay Sanker
3470 S. Waynesville Road
Morrow, Ohio
Phone: 513-899-3147

CLEVELAND

Susan Lohn
27385 Dunford Avenue
Westlake, Ohio 44145
Phone: 871-4227

Carole Lassak
6975 Carriage Hill
No. 101
Brecksville, Ohio 44141

Kathryn King
5129 Kneale Drive
Lyndhurst, Ohio 44124
Phone: 442-5743

Gail Bachmann
51 Ennis Avenue
Bedford, Ohio

ZANESVILLE

Gail Buchy
67 West Main-Apt. 3
New Concord, Ohio 43762
Phone: 826-4104

Deborah Ann Moore
Route 1
West Lafayette, Ohio

FAMILY LIFE DIRECTORS PARTICIPATING IN PROGRAM

Mrs. Thurley Zabor
Lakeview Terrace Family Life
1290 W. 25th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44113

Mrs. Alfreda Croft
Youngstown City Schools
20 W. Wood Street
Youngstown, Ohio 45503

Mrs. Julia Wilson
Muskingum Area JVS
400 Richards Road
Zanesville, Ohio 43701

Mrs. Alice Johnson
Metropolitan Homes and
Family Life
52 Starling Street
Columbus, Ohio 43222

Mrs. Lennie Hall
Dunbar Manor
1110 Staley Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45408

FAMILY LIFE INTERN PROGRAM
BLOCK PLAN OF ACTIVITIES

Date	Activities
June (1973) 18 - 22	Orientation Workshop
June 25 - 29	Interns begin participation in Family Life Program
July 2 - 6	Intern Participation
July 9 - 13	Two-Day Seminar Intern Participation
July 16 - 20	Intern Participation
July 23 - 27	Intern Participation
July 30 - Aug. 3	Intern Participation (perhaps one day for follow-up activities)

Program Director Visit Intern Centers

FAMILY LIFE INTERN ORIENTATION WORKSHOP

Monday, June 18, 1973		Tuesday, June 19, 1973	
Agenda:			
9:30-11:00	Introductions Overview of Workshop	9:00-10:30	Problems and Needs of Disadvantaged Families -Intern Panel Discussion -Group Discussion -Role Playing
11:00-12:00	Testing		
12:00- 1:15	Lunch		
1:30- 2:30	Testing		
2:30- 2:50	Afternoon Break	10:30-10:50	Break
2:50- 3:50	Testing	10:50-12:00	Continue with above
3:50- 4:30	Assignments Fill in Forms, Etc.	12:00- 1:15	Lunch
		1:30- 3:00	Communicating with Families Having Special Needs -Discussion -Games -Role Playing
		3:00- 3:20	Break
		3:20- 4:30	Continue with above

Wednesday, June 20, 1973		Thursday, June 21, 1973
9:00-12:00	Teaching Adults -Small Group Reports -Discussion	8:30-4:30
10:30-10:50	Break	
12:00- 1:15	Lunch	Field Trip to a Columbus Metropolitan Housing and Family Life Program
1:30- 3:00	Organization and Administration of Family Life Programs in Ohio	
3:00- 3:20	Break	A sack lunch will be prepared by the Imperial House Motel for your convenience
3:20- 4:30	Some Do's and Don'ts During Internship	

Friday, June 22, 1973

9:30-10:00	Cooperative Ventures in Impact-Family Life Education -Sonia M. Cole Assistant Director Vocational Education Home Economics Section
	Questions
10:00-11:00	Self Concept - Dr. Eugene Mayer Univ. of Northern Illinois
	Questions
11:00-11:45	Report on Infant Stimulation Program - Ms. Earladeen Badger Cincinnati
	Questions
12:00- 1:15	Lunch
	Working with the Disadvantaged -Dr. William Moore Ohio State University
1:30	Infant Stimulation Slides -From Parent-Child Center Mt. Carmel, Illinois
2:30	Opportunity for Questions Family Life Interns
	Conclusion

ORIENTATION WORKSHOP

Get Acquainted Letter to Family Life Director

On Monday evening write a get acquainted letter to the Family Life Director in your assigned area. You may want to include some of the following information in the letter:

Identify yourself.

Description of the community in which you have spent most of your life.

Family life—brothers, sisters, home influence—father's and mother's occupation.

Work experiences.

Experiences and contacts with children and youth with special needs.

Factors which influenced you to become a teacher.

Special abilities, skills and hobbies.

Personal traits—those which should be an asset, weaknesses.

Do you anticipate any special problems in working with adults in a Family Life Program.

READING NOTE SHEET

Orientation Workshop

Problems/concerns of Disadv.	Personal Characteristics of Disadvantaged (include language, value orientation, etc.)	Programs Need and/or Personal Competencies Needed to Teach Disadv. Adults
Title of Reference:		

47

PROGRAM

Mid Term Seminar
Imperial House Arlington

Thursday, July 19, 1973

10:00-12:00	Sharing of Intern Experiences as Related to Problems and Needs of Disadvantaged Families
12:00- 1:15	Lunch
1:15- 2:15	"Methods of Teaching Disadvantaged Adults" —Marsha Mills Home Economics Teacher South High School Columbus, Ohio
2:00- 3:00	Group Discussion
3:00- 3:30	Break
3:30- 5:00	Film: TENSE IMPERFECT

Friday, July 20, 1973

9:30-12:00	Experiences in Working With Adults in Expanded Nutrition Programs —Olive R. Woodyard Cooperative Extension Service
12:00- 1:15	Lunch
1:15- 3:30	Sharing of Readings and Resources —Interns

FAMILY LIFE INTERN PROGRAM

Follow Up Seminar
Imperial House Arlington
August 3, 1973

Agenda:

10:00-10:30	Announcements, etc.
10:30-12:00	"Working With Handicapped Families" —Kathy Sims Nisonger Center Ohio State University
12:00- 1:15	Lunch
1:15- 3:30	General Evaluation Testing

FAMILY LIFE INTERN PROGRAM

Follow Up Seminar
Imperial House Arlington
August 3, 1973

Agenda:

10:00-10:30	Announcements, etc.
10:30-12:00	"Working With Handicapped Families" —Kathy Sims Nisonger Center Ohio State University
12:00- 1:15	Lunch
1:15- 3:30	General Evaluation
	Testing

WEEKLY LOG

Name _____

Intern Center _____

Date: Week of _____

General Comments: (Include comments on new learnings, reinforced learnings, methods of teaching, meeting needs of adults, etc.)

Personal Traits Needed While Working With Adults this Week:

Home Economics Knowledge and Skills Needed While Working With Adults:

Communication Skills Needed:

Problems Encountered This Week:

Summary of Activities Carried Out This Week:

INTERN EXPERIENCE STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: The following is a list of statements about the usefulness of the intern experience. Consider each statement carefully. Indicate how you feel about each statement by circling one of the posible choices.

Section I The intern experience was useful in helping me to understand:	Very Useful	Useful	Somewhat Useful	Uncertain	Not Useful
1. The kind of environment which promotes learning.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
2. Differences in the mental abilities among adult learners.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
3. The different paces at which adults learn.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
4. Differences in the interests of adults.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
5. Differences in the emotional development of adult learners.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
6. Ways of identifying adult problems in learning.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
7. The elements of the teaching-learning situation which have an effect upon adult behavior.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
8. The content of course offerings in home economics.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
9. The specific skills needed for successful teaching of home economics.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
10. How to use effectively a variety of teaching techniques.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
11. How to use instructional materials in a way that promotes learning.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
12. The role of the teacher in the family life program.	VU	U	SU	O	NU

13. The various responsibilities of the family life director.	VU	U	SU	O	NU
14. The atmosphere or "tone" of a learning situation.	VU	U	SU	O	NU

Section II

Directions: Indicate your feelings about each of the following questions by circling one of the three choices:

	Yes	No	Uncertain
1. Did you look forward to the intern experience each week?	Y	N	U
2. Do you feel that the workshop helped to prepare you for the experience? Explain.	Y	N	U
3. Did you do the things that you thought you would do when you first began the intern experience? If not, what did you expect?	Y	N	U
4. Did you feel that you spent more time each week participating than you should?	Y	N	U
5. Do you feel that you gradually lost interest in the intern experience? If yes, why?	Y	N	U
6. Do you feel that the intern experience contributed to your preparation for student teaching or teaching?	Y	N	U
7. Do you feel that the mid-term seminar discussion was helpful? Explain.	Y	N	U

Section III

General Comments:

DIRECTOR-TEACHER EVALUATION

OF

FAMILY LIFE INTERN EXPERIENCE

1. Do you feel that the interns were able to establish favorable working relationships with the adults in class? Why or why not?

2. Do you feel that the interns worked well with the teacher(s) in the Family Life Programs? Why or why not?

3. If given another opportunity, what would you do differently to meet the needs of the interns?

4. Identify problems which arose out of the intern experience which might be of concern when planning for future intern programs.

5. What could be done to alleviate problems or improve situations as identified in Number 4?

6. To what extent do you think the intern experience helped to prepare the interns for teaching?

7. Give some indication of your personal feelings concerning the value and/or limitations of the experience.

TABLE 6

ATTITUDE SCORES ON SUB-CATEGORIES OF THE TEACHER AND THE COMMUNITY INVENTORY

	Sub-Categories	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Mean Diff.	S.D.	"t" Value
II	A. City People B. Town People C. Farm People	19.0952	19.6031	-0.5079	1.063	-2.19*
III	A. Divorces B. Working Mothers	30.9286	30.3810	0.5476	2.554	0.98
V	A. Little Education B. College Education	28.0952	29.1429	-1.0476	3.240	-1.48
VII	A. Catholics B. Jews C. Protestants	19.7619	19.9047	-0.1429	1.493	-0.44
VIII	A. Upper Class B. Middle Class	27.000	26.5714	0.4286	1.825	1.08
X	A. Youth B. Aged	27.3810	27.8571	-0.4762	4.303	-0.51

*Significant at .05 level.

SUMMARY OF WEEKLY LOGS

I General Comments	Frequency
A. New and Reinforced Learnings	
1. New experiences and awarenesses of different people and modes of life	44
2. Recognition of needs of others (i.e. legal problems, housing, family life problems.	16
3. Recognition of specific learning needs in home economics knowledge and skills	65
4. Recognition of needs for:	
Honesty and openness	12
Flexibility	9
Individuality of all people	6
Specific needs of women	5
Etc. (e.g.) "finding way around city"	3
B. Teaching Methods	
Informal; simple	12
Learn while doing	9
Teaching one thing at a time; patience, slowness	8
Field trips	7
Individual instruction and attention	2
C. Meeting Needs of Adults	
Immediate results, approval, rewards	9
Positive reinforcement and praise	8
Motivation; be willing to listen	7
Indirect learning through sincerity, exchange, empathy	6
D. Additional General Comments	
Self-awareness, learning about self, "eye-openers"	19
Feelings of frustration due to:	
Racial feelings; resentment of Blacks towards Whites and vice versa	8
Lack of organization from others	6
Cultural differences	5
Poor treatment of children by parents	5

SUMMARY OF WEEKLY LOGS
Continued

Feelings of satisfaction:

Personal success, self confidence	34
New realizations—self awareness	26
New personal friendships through helping	6
Handling of specific problems	6

II. Personal Traits Needed

Recognition and acceptance of different life styles, values, racial differences; general openmindedness and understanding	31
Sensitivity to needs; praise, reassurance, empathy	30
Tact, diplomacy, respect	22
Attempts, (risks) towards friendliness	18
Honesty, openness, sincerity, naturalness	16
Love and affection	16
Flexibility	14
Ability to catch on to new procedures	14
Availability, readiness and willingness to help	13
Ability to touch	12
Personal motivation (i.e. when tired; desire to communicate	11
Ability to admit you don't know	11
Avoid authoritarianism	11
(Honest) enthusiasm	9
Sense of humor; cheerfulness	6
Ability to give and accept appreciation sincerely	6
Ability to give positive reinforcement	6
Creativity	6
Ability to make quick decisions; quick thinking	6

III. Home Economics Skills Needed While Working With Adults

Clothing construction, fabric knowledge and care, pattern making	57
Nutrition and Foods; i.e. budgeting, eliminating falacies, preparation skills	27
Child care knowledge and skills	22
Planning skills	19
Furniture knowledge; refinishing and upholstering	18
Consumer Economics; consumer education	16

SUMMARY OF WEEKLY LOGS
Continued

All Home Economics skills, concepts	15
Skills—family problem-solving, family living, family relations	11
Experience vs. theory; "how to make things really work"	8
Creativity; artistic skills	7
Gardening	4

IV. Communication Skills Needed

Listening, hearing, comprehending	38
Giving directions in clear, concise manner	29
To put self at other's level; forget differences	13
Speaking skills:	
General self expression	6
Ability to carry on "small talk"	12
Personal contact (touching, holding)	9
Conveying cheerfulness and enthusiasm, smiling	6
To give individual help	5

V. Problems Encountered

Problems with and about children; i.e. inability to accept type of child disciplining	20
Lack of knowledge; i.e. subject at hand, specific technique	17
Poor class attendance or lateness; cancellation of class because of lack of attendance	15
Listening, and other communication problems	12
Racial problems; i.e. discussing race; recognition of differences; fear of city, ill-at-ease	10
Transportation problems	6
Feelings; i.e. about leaving; other personal feelings	4
Prejudice among peers, or poor peer relationships	3

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SELECTED READINGS
(Orientation Workshop)

Axline, Virginia. Dibs: In Search of Self. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964.

Bagdikian, B. H. In the Midst of Plenty, The Poor in America. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Bloom, Benjamin S. Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Brown, Claude. Manchild In The Promised Land. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1965.

Caplovitz, David. The Poor Pay More. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Conant, James B. Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.

Fantini, Mario and Weinstein, Gerald. The Disadvantaged: Challenge To Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.

Frost, Joe L. and Glenn R. Hawkes. The Disadvantaged Child, Issues and Innovations. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966.

Gardner, John. Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? New York: Harper Bros., 1961.

Goodman, Paul. Compulsory Miseducation.

Harrington, Michael. The Other America. New York: Macmillan, 1962.

Havinghurst, Robert J. Education in Metropolitan Areas. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.

Herndon, James. The Way It Spozed To Be. New York: Simon & Shuster, 1968.

Hickerson, Nathaniel. Education for Alienation. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Kohl, Herbert. Thirty-Six Children. New York: Signet Books, 1967.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SELECTED READINGS
(Continued)

Kontos, Peter G. and Murphy, James J. (ed.). Teaching Urban Youth. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

Ornstein, Allan C. Urban Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1972.

Passow, Harry A. (ed.). Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Riessman, Frank. Helping the Disadvantaged Pupil to Learn More Easily. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

_____. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row Publishing, 1962.

Taba, Hilda and Elkins, Deborah. Teaching Strategies for the Culturally Disadvantaged. Chicago: Rand and McNally Co., 1966.

Strom, Robert. Inner City Classroom Teacher Behaviors. Merrill Publishers, 1965.

_____. Teaching in Slum Schools. Merrill Publishers, 1966.

_____. The Tragic Migration. Washington D.C.: NEA Press, 1964.